

REMARKS

The final Office Action of October 24, 2008 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 25-30 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 31-39 have been added and claims 1-5, 7, 9-17, 19 and 21-24 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-24 and 31-39 are pending. Entry of the amendments, reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 13-16, 19-21 and 25-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,521, “Shaffer”) in view of Hirni *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,609, “Hirni”). Claims 5, 6, 10-12, 17, 18 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer in view of Hirni and Salama *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,093, “Salama”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

“monitoring, at a router, a control signaling message transmitted between two network end-points, the control signal message being component-specific for one of: separate audio, video and data component streams, the audio, video and data component streams each forming a separate media component of a plurality of separate media components of a multimedia stream transmitted between the two network end-points.”

None of the cited references, either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests such features. In particular, nowhere does Shaffer or Hirni teach or suggest that a control signal message monitored at a router is component-specific to one of separate audio, video and data component streams of a multimedia stream. Shaffer merely states that a H.323 gateway 105 may include an in-band signaling monitor 107 to monitor and intercept in-band signaling and to provide control signals to the H.323 terminals. Shaffer lacks a teaching or suggestion that the control signal provided by the in-band signaling monitor are *component-specific* to one of separate audio, video and data component streams, as recited in claim 1. Hirni and Salama are similarly deficient. While Hirni describes some processing of audio and video streams, Hirni fails to teach or suggest monitoring for component-specific control signals. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Additionally, claim 1 further recites, *inter alia*, “applying, at the router, a connection control issued by the control means to the separate media components, wherein the connection control enables: modification of the control signaling messages related to the separate media components.” Neither Shaffer nor Hirni, either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests these features. The Office Action concedes that Shaffer does not teach or suggest permitting signaling messages related to separate media components to be modified. Instead, the Office Action relies on Hirni. However, the cited passages of Hirni lack a teaching or suggestion of modification of a control signal message related to a separate media component. Merely directing the message to Q.931 component, as described by Hirni, does not constitute modification of a control signaling message.

In response to Applicants’ previously submitted arguments to this effect, the Office Action does not address the merits of Applicant’s remarks, and instead asserts that the claim language is incorrect, substituting the Office’s own language into the claim. Applicants disagree with the Office Action’s characterization of the originally filed specification and the claimed features recited above and substitution. The originally filed specification clearly supports the modification of control signaling messaging as evidenced at p. 4, ll. 12-17, p. 5, ll. 22-30 and p. 6, ll. 16-23. Salama is similarly deficient. Accordingly, Applicants’ respectfully submit that the Office Action is non-responsive as it fails to address all of the claimed features. Claim 1 is thus allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 2-12 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 12 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the switching of the separate media components includes switching IP packet payloads carrying one of the separate media components between an incoming packet stream and an outgoing packet stream.” The Office Action concedes that that neither Shaffer nor Hirni teach or suggest such a feature. However, the Office Action asserts Salama describes switching of separate media components including switching IP packet payloads between incoming and outgoing packet streams. Applicants respectfully disagree. Nowhere does Salama teach or suggest switching IP packet payloads between incoming and outgoing streams. The cited passage, for example, is entirely devoid of any teaching or suggestion of switching packet payloads, much less between incoming and outgoing packet streams. Accordingly, claim 12 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 13 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is thus allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 14-24 are dependent on claim 13 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

New Claims

Claims 31-39 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the claimed features may be found throughout the originally filed specification.

Claim 31 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is thus allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 32-35 are dependent on claim 31 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 31 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 36-39 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 16, 2009

By: /Chunhsing Andy Mu/
Chunhsing Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001